

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 were pending in the application. (The Office Action summary is incorrect.) Claims 1-27 stand rejected. Claims 1 and 26 were amended. Claim 28 was added. Claims 1-28 remain in the application.

The drawings filed on December 19, 2001 were objected to by the examiner as, in some cases, not being easy to read. Formal drawings replacing the earlier filed drawings are submitted herewith. Figures 8A and 8B were objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5), in that the reference numerals 804 and 802 were mistakenly interchanged. The specification has been amended, obviating any need to change reference numerals 802 and 804 in the drawings. It is understood that the Office Action's statement that the informal drawings were not of sufficient quality to permit examination and the inclusion of two different due dates within the office action were inadvertent.

The specification was objected to as requiring an update of U.S. Patent Application numbers on page 2. This was done.

The specification was objected to because of a grammatical error on page 8, line 8. This was corrected.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16 and 27 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Burt et al. (US Patent 5,649,032 A). Claims 3, 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burt et al. (US Patent 5,649,032 A) in view of Armstrong et al. (US Patent 6,580,457 B1). Claims 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burt et al. (US Patent 5,649,032 A) in view of Seitz et al. (View Mophing, Proceedings of the 23rd annual conference on Computer graphics and interactive techniques, ACM Press, 1996, pp. 21-30). Claims 17, 18, 22, 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burt et al. (US Patent 5,649,032 A) in view of Yoshida et al. (US Patent 6,266,128 B1). Claims 19, 20, 21 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burt et al. (US Patent 5,649,032 A) in view of Suzuki et al. (US Patent 6,094,218 A).

The amended claims are supported by the application as filed, notably at page 3, lines 29-31; page 4, lines 17-20; and Figure 2.

The rejection of Claims 1 and 26 states (in relevant part) that Burt teaches a method and means comprising:

Amendments to the Drawings:

Formals drawings are submitted herewith under separate Letter to the Draftsperson which incorporate the changes required by the Examiner.

Approval by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

Attachment: Replacement Figure 1-13B

"e) means for selecting the cropping region (Fig. 5, step 506:SELECT REGION OF INTEREST SIZE AND SHAPE) of the composite digital image (mosaic image of figure 2A.) according to the cropping criterion (Fig. 5, step 502:SELECT SELECTION FUNCTION AND PARAMETERS), said cropping region (Fig. 5, step 506:SELECT REGION OF INTEREST SIZE AND SHAPE) being a rectangular region having aspect ratio L:H (A shape of (a region of interest according to step 506 of figure 5 can be a square, rectangle, triangle which has dimensions.), and having size ("SIZE" of step 506) and location ("REGION OF INTEREST" of step 506) determined by the cropping criterion (Fig. 5, step 502:SELECT SELECTION FUNCTION AND PARAMETERS) and;"

In Claims 1 and 26, the selection of the cropping region is automatic. This contrasts with the cited reference, in which the user makes the selection:

"At step 502, the user selects a selection function and associated control parameters for the selected function." (Burt, col. 10, lines 61-63, emphasis added)

"At step 506, the user defines certain parameters to control the cropping function, e.g., select a region of interest in an image or mosaic." (Burt, col. 11, lines 2-4, emphasis added)


Claims 2-25 and 27 are allowable as depending from Claims 1 and 26, respectively.

Added Claim 28 is supported and allowable on the same basis as Claims 1 and 26.

It is believed that these changes now make the claims clear and definite and, if there are any problems with these changes, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 30,700

Robert Luke Walker/amb
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (585) 588-2739
Facsimile: (585) 477-1148

Enclosures: Replacement Drawings Figures 1 – 13B
Letter to the Draftsperson
Copies of Formal Drawings

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.